

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-34, and 36-39 are pending. Claims 1, 13, and 25 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 13, and 25.

IDS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to initial and return the Information Disclosure Statements mailed on 11/23/2004 and 10/24/2008.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 are amended for purposes of clarification. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, as support for these amendments may be found, for example, on pages 6-7 and in Figure 1 of the Specification.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the

following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference....” MPEP § 2143(A).

Claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-34, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,194,439 (“Kassan”) in view of US Pub. No. 2002/0156824 (“Armstrong”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The amended independent claims require, in part, (i) a plurality of virtual operating system environments (VOSEs), wherein each VOSE comprises one partition of a global file system; and (ii) a first system accounting log file (SALF) stored in a first file system partition associated with the first VOSE. That is, the claimed invention requires a global file system (*e.g.*, 180 in Figure 1) that is partitioned (*e.g.*, 180a, 180b in Figure 1) and one partition of the file system is associated with each VOSE. A file system partition is completely separate and distinct from a VOSE. *See* Specification, pages 6-7 and Figure 1. The global file system is executed by the global operating system, and is responsible for managing and storing files. Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited prior art references disclose or render obvious a VOSE that comprises a partition of a global file system, where the accounting information for each process executed in the VOSE is stored in the corresponding file system partition.

Specifically, Kassan relates to correlating job accounting information with software licensing information. *See* Kassan, Abstract. Kassan discloses logical partitions of an operating system (LPARs). *See* Kassan, col. 1, ll. 44-60. However, Kassan is completely silent with respect

to each LPAR including a partition of a global file system. In fact, Kassan does not even mention a file system. Moreover, Kassan does not render a file system partition obvious, because Kassan has no need to manage, organize, and/or provide access to files when correlating data among two entities. It follows from the above that Kassan cannot possibly teach storing the accounting information in a file system partition corresponding to the VOSE. At best, Kassan discloses logging accounting information directly in an LPAR, which is distinct from storing the accounting information in a file system executed by the LPAR. Accordingly, Kassan fails to disclose or render obvious the limitations of the amended independent claims required by (i) and (ii) above.

Further, Armstrong fails to disclose or render obvious that which Kassan lacks. Armstrong is directed to allocating processor resources in a logically partitioned computer system. *See* Armstrong, Abstract. However, like Kassan, Armstrong is completely silent with respect to any type of file system. Thus, it logically follows that Armstrong fails to disclose or render obvious that each computer system partition includes a corresponding file system partition of the global file system, where accounting information of a process executing in a computer system partition is stored in the corresponding file system partition executed by that computer system partition. Accordingly, Armstrong fails to disclose or render obvious the limitations of the amended independent claims required by (i) and (ii) above.

In view of the above, it is clear that the Examiner's contentions fail to support an obviousness rejection of the amended independent claims. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 33227/466001).

Dated: June 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
3945 Freedom Circle, Suite 300
Santa Clara, California 95054
(408) 727-0600
(408) 727-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant